
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

ABEL MORENO SANTOYO,

Movant,

versus

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:19-CV-390

**MEMORANDUM ORDER ADOPTING THE
MAGISTRATE JUDGE’S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Movant, Abel Moreno Santoyo, a federal prisoner currently confined at FCI Bastop, proceeding *pro se*, filed this motion to vacate, set aside, or correct sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255.

The court referred this matter to the Honorable Zack Hawthorn, United States Magistrate Judge, at Beaumont, Texas, for consideration pursuant to applicable laws and orders of this court. The Magistrate Judge recommends denying the motion to vacate, set aside or correct sentence (doc. # 8).

The court received and considered the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge filed pursuant to such referral, along with the record, and pleadings. No objections to the Report and Recommendation have been filed to date.¹

¹ Movant received a copy of the Report and Recommendation on June 12, 2022 (doc. # 9).


ORDER

Accordingly, the findings of fact and conclusions of law of the Magistrate Judge are correct and the report of the Magistrate Judge is **ADOPTED**. A Final Judgment will be entered in this case in accordance with the Magistrate Judge's recommendations.

Furthermore, the court is of the opinion Movant is not entitled to a certificate of appealability. An appeal from a judgment denying post-conviction collateral relief may not proceed unless a judge issues a certificate of appealability. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253. The standard for a certificate of appealability requires Movant to make a substantial showing of the denial of a federal constitutional right. *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 483-84 (2000); *Elizalde v. Dretke*, 362 F.3d 323, 328 (5th Cir. 2004). To make a substantial showing, Movant need not establish that he would prevail on the merits. Rather, he must demonstrate that the issues are subject to debate among jurists of reasons, that a court could resolve the issues in a different manner, or that the questions presented are worthy of encouragement to proceed further. *See Slack*, 529 U.S. at 483-84. Any doubt regarding whether to grant a certificate of appealability should be resolved in favor of Movant, and the severity of the penalty may be considered in making this determination. *See Miller v. Johnson*, 200 F.3d 274, 280-81 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 531 U.S. 849 (2000).

In this case, Movant has not shown that the issues are subject to debate among jurists of reasons or worthy of encouragement to proceed further. A certificate of appealability shall not issue in this matter.

SIGNED at Beaumont, Texas, this 26th day of July, 2022.



MARCIA A. CRONE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE